

Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

July 11, 2012, 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Present are: Planning Commission Assistant Chair Mary Anderson, Leon Day, Joe Nielsen, Paul Rasmussen, and Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Scott Olsen, and Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Gayelene Henrikson. (Chair Thell Stewart, Gene Jacobson and Steve Anderson are excused.)

Meeting is called to order by Assistant Chair Mary Anderson.

THOMAS BOEKWEG: REQUESTS APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON HIS PROPERTY WITH AN EXISTING HOME. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED 1.25 MILES NORTH OF SPRING CITY ON 10.60 ACRES IN THE A ZONE ON S 26332X.

Thomas Boekweg is present. Scott reviews request. Thomas Boekweg is requesting approval for a conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling unit on his property with an existing home. His property is located 1.25 miles north of Spring City on 10.60 acres in the A zone on S26332x. Site plan is shown. The accessory dwelling will be stick built 50 feet from the main home. Photos are shown of the existing home and the floor plan of the accessory dwelling. Zoning allows a dimension of a minimum of 400 sq ft and a maximum of 500 sq ft of living space. Utilities are established. The dwelling will be hooked to the main house septic. Motion is made by Joe Nielsen to approve the conditional use permit. Motion is seconded by Leon Day. Motion passes.

WILLIAM ARVIL & BARBARA JAMES: REQUESTS APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR ALTERNATIVE POWER ON THEIR PROPERTY WITH A HOME UNDER CONSTRUCTION. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ½ MILE SOUTH OF FOUNTAIN GREEN ON 8.78 ACRES IN THE RA-1 ZONE ON S 21383.

Both are present. Scott reviews request. William Arvil and Barbara James requests approval of a conditional use permit for alternative power on their property with a home under construction. Their property is located ½ mile south of Fountain Green east of the highway on 8.78 acres in the RA-1 zone on S 21383. Prior to the meeting, two adjoining property owners voiced their opinion to Mr. Olsen, in favor of the permit. Natural gas will be provided, but the power is across the highway and because of the cost to bring Rocky Mountain Power into his property, he has chosen to do alternative power.

In Mr. Arvil's researching, Arizona is first to sunshine with Utah coming in second on solar energy potential. The Federal Government will reimburse 30% of the cost to install solar panels as a tax deduction. He would purchase a single forklift battery with a 30 year guarantee as part of the installation. Mr. Arvil talked to other residents across Utah that use solar panels to power their residence and found the panels to be cost efficient enough to not use their generator. By installing the alternative power versus bringing in the power across the street, he will save himself a considerable amount of money.

Photos are shown of the placement of the panels on the property by the home under construction. They will be placed behind a 32 ft equipment shed and behind home on the south side . There won't be a glare from the panels to harm traffic on the road. Motion is made by Paul Ramussen to approve the conditional use permit. Motion is seconded by Joe Nielsen. Motion passes.

JERY L. NIELSEN: REQUESTS APPROVAL FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A DOG KENNEL WITH NO MORE THAN 10 ADULT DOGS, DOG RUNS, KENNEL BUILDING AND TRAINING OWN DOGS. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ½ MILE SOUTH OF SPRING CITY ON A ½ ACRE IN THE A ZONE ON S 26801x1.

Jery Nielsen and husband, Ross are present. Scott reviews request. Mrs. Nielsen requests approval for a conditional use permit for a dog kennel with no more than 10 adult dogs, dog runs, kennel building and training own dog. Her property is located ½ mile south of Spring City on a ½ acre in the A zone on S 26801x1. The kennel will house Ms. Nielsen's show, champion blood line yellow labs. She will start out with 4 females. What residents are near that could be affected? A neighbor, Linda Nielsen, lives across the street and she has horses and a dog groomery. No one is located on the west. There is an occupied residential home on the east. The dogs will be fenced and housed in covered kennels on the westside of the house. They reside indoors at night. Paul commented about the Animals Kennels, Boarding, etc. zone ordinance and the need for a conditional use permit.

Topic was brought up about the property being in the new buffer zone which doesn't allow dog kennels. At the time of filing for the conditional use permit the property was in the A zone, however with the passing of the buffer zone, the property is in the RA-2 zone. A Spring City resident asked Mr. Olsen if the kennels are permitted since it is now in the buffer zone. Mr. Olsen explained about the time frame of the application and the final approval of the buffer zone. The resident was satisfied with the proposal.

Scott addresses the possibility of noise being a concern. Ms. Nielsen needs to be cognizant of the excessive noise and take reasonable measures to mitigate barking dogs. Motion is made by Leon Day to approve the conditional use permit for a dog kennel with a clause to take care of noise issues. Motion is seconded by Joe Nielsen. Motion passes. Business license is approved, needs to pay for license at the Clerk's office..

CHARLES AND PEGGY ROSS: REQUESTS APPROVAL OF A 1-LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ON 19.88 ACRES IN THE A ZONE ON S 27338x1. THE SUBDIVISION WILL HAVE 5.5 ACRES. THEY HAVE ALL THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS.

Charles Ross is present. Scott Olsen reviews the request. Charles and Peggy Ross requests approval of a 1-lot minor subdivision. Their property is located on 19.88 acres in the A zone on S 27338x1. The subdivision will have 5.5 acres. They have all the required documents. The subdivision is located 2 ½ miles south of Spring City on the east side of Pigeon Hollow Road in the cedars. Mylar is provided, however the mylar is

lacking markers showing the lot placement. Mr. Ross will make sure the markers are in place before final approval from the County Commissioners. The surveyor certified the mylar stating the markers are shown. Mr. Ross kept the frontage of 200'. There is an existing well. Power is through Rocky Mtn power. Access is already in and Steve Keller has approved the road. Motion is made by Joe Nielsen to approve the 1-lot minor subdivision. Motion is seconded by Leon Day. Motion passes. Mr. Ross will meet with the County Commissioners at their next meeting for final approval.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion is made by Paul Rasmussen to approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 13, 2012 with minimal corrections. The motion is seconded by Leon Day, and the motion passes.

WORK MEETING- INDUSTRIAL ZONE ORDINANCE

Scott Olsen presented a draft of the Industrial Zone Ordinance (IN) he prepared from the items and desires the planning commission discussed at their last meeting. See attached draft. The ordinance starts with a Purpose, then the Table of Standards.

Mr. Olsen figured the 90' measurement from 60' is required for the frontage road and then the county standard of 30' for the setback.

Mr. Day discusses the requiring of a frontage road with having a setback or a 60' frontage road. Is requiring a frontage road necessary? Off a State Highway, yes; Off a County Road, maybe not. In some cases, a frontage road might be necessary, others could have the 2 entrances per 20 acres requirement. Mr. Day suggested modifying the 60' from highway with no frontage; but having a 90' connecting road through the property. Do away with the Frontage standard and combine with State Highway Setbacks. Have two options for access to the State Highway by having 2 entrances or a frontage road. If the property is on a State Highway and has access to a County road, do they need a frontage road? Can they use the County road instead of having a frontage. State highways require a 50' setback.

Write up the ordinance so the developer has a choice:

Two Entrances: having 2 entrances with a 60' wide road connecting road all the way through with a 50' set back from State Highway

Or

Frontage Road: having a frontage road with 30' set back.

Make the IBC/IFC make the codes not the ordinance.

Permitted Uses:

Sexually oriented issues have not been included in the general matrix; we are adding it to the (IN) zone.

Highlight or bold "but not limited to" under paragraph #3.

Site plan:

Site plan section is taken from other counties ordinance that was discussed at the June 2012 meeting. The contents section is covered well and is acceptable to the members.

It was suggested to add another item addressing projects with phases. When a developer comes with a project(s) that spans more than 1 or 2 years time and has phases to the project, this item would cover the base of what we want to know about the project, what expectations the developer has for the phase plan in their project and then the project can be approved or disapproved. Have this item be “if applicable”, then you need to comply with this content.

12. Phasing (if applicable): What is the overall goal of the project; list all the phases of the project; then outline the phase plan.

Site plan approval:

Should the ordinance have a site plan approval or combine it with the site plan review? It was suggested to combine the site plan approval with site plan review and title it-

Site Plan Review/Approval.

Special Provisions:

We currently have nothing on parking/lighting regulations, but the IBC has to be met. Include municipalities in the Utilities section as well as under the Fire Protection section.

Do we want more?

Buffer Zone:

Mr. Day suggested including a section covering Industrial Zones within a buffer zone. The land in the buffer zone will need to be re-zoned to the Industrial Zone. Mr. Nielsen suggested we offer a “carrot” to the cities. Loosen the requirements of the IN zone so that whatever that particular city wants can be put in place. Cities must be willing to provide services in the buffer zone. Mr. Rasmussen clarified the point that if land is Industrial zoned in the buffer zone, and the city annexes the property into the city, the buffer zone goes through the process to have it redrawn. If a developer is interested in having a project inside the buffer zone, the county will go by city requirements under their requirements and the planning commission will only approve projects if the city extends utilities to the project.

Mr. Nielsen stated that the County is encouraging projects to go to the buffer zones of the cities. The Planning Commission is open to review what the city is approving and work together with the city, allowing the Cities to work closer together with the County. Include in the IN zone a policy to get the city on board. Cities may modify the “Table of Standard”; review the site plan review/approval; go with the cities requirements, provided the city gives the developer access to the utilities.

Review the whole buffer zone throughout the county. Look at the county's requirement in the buffer zone and the city's requirements and shrink buffer zone down so the little projects aren't stuck with the big projects, ie curb and gutters.

Under Special Provisions add a J. The county is encouraging the development of the IN inside the buffer zones. To enhance development within buffer zones, the county has turned to the cities stating: modification to size and distance can be made, if the IN zone is within a buffer zone, then the Planning Commission will review the proposal to ensure the other components of the zone are met. The county's requirements will be what the cities requirements are, if the city will extend its services to the IN zone.

Members will discuss further at the next meeting what more, if any, is needed to make this chapter work and any additional ideas that are brought to the table.

With no further business before the Planning Commission, motion to adjourn is made by Joe Nielsen. The motion is seconded by Paul Rasmussen, and the motion passes.

The meeting is adjourned at 7:56 P.M.